

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to correct a minor error in the Claim language.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauch (US 5,467,264) in view of Chambers (WO 98/16886).

Rauch

Rauch discloses an automated control device for providing a user with selectively interdependent control of devices. An identification of a first device and a second device is obtained from the user via the user interface. The user defines a dependency relationship such that the second device has a status which depends on the status of the first device. When the status of the first device changes, the status of the second device is updated in accordance with the dependency relationship defined by the user (col.1, 1.33-53).

A device control program executing on the computer maintains the status of each device and in-/activates the device accordingly. A device status table is provided with an entry for each device which entry comprises a condition field for the device. The condition field of the device contains all devices having a status affected by the status of the device (col.2, 8-20).

When a device changes status, the entry for the device having the changed status is located and all affected devices are identified in the device condition field. The status of each device is then updated (col.3, 1.2-5).

In Rauch, when the status of a device changes, the status is updated of all devices which depend on that device and the devices are then activated or deactivated based on the updated status (col.4, 1.3-4). In addition, Rauch discloses that the computer monitors the status of each device and determines when a status changes (col.4, 1.1-5). For example, the motion detector indicates to the computer that it has been activated. Thus, Rauch neither suggests nor discloses an identifier in the first call that enables conditionally invoking the dependency relationship.

First, the invention discloses conditionally invoking the route whereas Rauch discloses identifying all devices of which the state depends on the first device and updating all identified

devices. Thus, Rauch teaches away from conditionally invoking the dependency relationship since all identified dependency relationships are invoked.

Second, Rauch only mentions the state of the first device changing and the computer monitoring the states to detect a change. Rauch neither discloses nor suggests a first call to the first device that caused its state to change. Consequently, Rauch also neither discloses nor suggests an identifier associated with the first call that enables conditionally invoking the dependency relationship since Rauch does not disclose the first call itself.

Chambers

Chambers neither suggests a change of a first property of a device causing a second call to be issued with the second call enabling a change of the second property. As a result, Chambers neither suggests conditionally invoking a route linking the first property to the second property so that change in the first property causes the second call being issued. Thus, Chambers neither suggests nor discloses the claim limitation of the first call to the first object having associated an identifier enabling to conditionally invoke the route.

Neither Rauch nor Chambers discloses or suggests the claim limitation of the first call to the first object having an identifier associated with it that enables conditionally invoking the route. Thus, neither Rauch nor Chambers discloses or suggests the invention as claimed. The Examiner has not shown a prima facie case of obviousness and the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 under 35USC103(a) is therefore incorrect.

It is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Rauch in view of Chambers. It is also respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2-7 and 9 are patentable over Rauch in view of Chambers at least based on their dependencies.


Applicant respectfully submits that he has answered all issues raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Such allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270.

Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 2, 2002

By 
Gwenaelle Le Pennec
Limited Recognition under 37 C.F.R 10.9(b)
(408) 617-4837

APPENDIX A

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made to the Claims

The following is a marked up version of amended Claims 1:

- 1.(AMENDED) An information processing system comprising:
- a first physical component represented by a first software object;
 - a second physical component represented by a second software object;
 - the first object has at least a first property that is changeable through a first call to the first object;
 - the second object has at least a second property that is changeable through a second call to the second object;
 - the system enables registering a property route linking the first property to the second property so that a change in the first property causes the second call to be issued to the second object upon invoking the property route; and
 - the [input] first call to the first object has associated with it an identifier enabling to conditionally invoke the route.